



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/888,380	06/26/2001	Yuji Kamikawa	33082M088	9509

7590

07/07/2003

Smith, Gambrell & Russell, LLP
Beveridge, DeGrandi, Weilacher & Young
Intellectual Property Group
1850 M Street, N.W., Suite 800
Washington, DC 20036

EXAMINER

PERRIN, JOSEPH L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1746

DATE MAILED: 07/07/2003

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/888,380

Applicant(s)

KAMIKAWA, YUJI

Examiner

Joseph Perrin, Ph.D.

Art Unit

1746

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 June 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 14-31 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5-7 and 10-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2-4,8 and 9 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 June 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 1746

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Group I, claims 1-13 in Paper No. 6 is acknowledged.
2. Claims 14-31 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to nonelected inventions, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in Paper No. 6.

Priority

3. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Specification

4. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Art Unit: 1746

5. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abstract exceeds 150 word. Also, in line 15 the term "hosing" should be --housing--. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

6. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Objections

7. Claims 2, 3 and 8 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. The claims are directed to future intended use and fail to provide any further structural limitations to the claimed apparatus. How the apparatus "moves" or "holds" is considered operational usage of the apparatus and, therefore does not provide any type of structural limitation, as required for apparatus claims. Accordingly, these claims have not been further treated on the merits.

8. Claims 6, 11 and 12 are objected to because of the following informalities: In line 2 in each dependent claim, the term "devise" should be --device-- because the claims 5

Art Unit: 1746

& 10 from which they depend are directed to a "substrate transfer device". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

10. Claims 1, 5-7 and 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US 5,873,177 to Honda *et al.* (hereinafter "Honda").

Re claim 1, Honda discloses a liquid processing apparatus having a process chamber 30/69, a substrate rotating device including holder 15 and rotating device 2, a posture changing mechanism 10a/10b, and a position adjusting mechanism 23/23d, (see entire reference of Honda, for instance, Figures 19-21 and col. 14, line 15 *et seq.*).

Re claims 5-7 and 10-13 Honda further discloses a container delivery section 40b, a substrate transfer device including a plurality of transfer arms 40, a plurality of treating units 61-69, a moving mechanism 32 to gain access to the substrate rotating device, a mechanism 40c which adjusts the distance between each adjacent arm, and the holder being "capable" of holding substrates in two containers (e.g. 30 and 80) (see, for instance, Figures 1 and 19A-J).

Allowable Subject Matter

11. Claims 4 and 9 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

12. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

13. The closest prior art of record, Honda, fails to teach each and every limitation of the instant invention. Specifically, Honda fails to teach the claimed apparatus further including the process chamber being a double wall structure with inner chamber movable between the process position within the outside chamber and the retreat position outside the outside chamber, which is disclosed as an essential element of claimed invention, as described in claims 4 and 9.

14. For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 4 and 9, dependent on claim 1, are believed to recite patentable subject matter.

Conclusion

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US 6,068,002 to Kamikawa *et al.*, which discloses a wafer processing apparatus with mechanism for rotating wafers 90 degrees.

US 6,009,890 to Kaneko *et al.*, which discloses a substrate transporting apparatus with mechanism for rotating wafers 90 degrees.

Art Unit: 1746

US 5,055,036 to Asano *et al.*, which discloses a wafer boat loading/unloading apparatus including 90 degree rotation mechanism.


16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph Perrin, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (703)305-0626. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-5:00, except alternate Fridays.

17. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Randy Gulakowski can be reached on (703)308-4333. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)872-9310 for regular communications and (703)872-9311 for After Final communications.

18. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-0661.

Joseph Perrin, Ph.D.
Examiner
Art Unit 1746

jlp
June 24, 2003



RANDY GULAKOWSKI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700